



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,432	03/20/2001	Curtis E. Scott	LD-10807/GEC 2 0153	9837

7590 04/09/2003

Timothy E. Nauman, Esq.
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan,
Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

GILMAN, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/812,432		Applicant(s) SCOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner Alexander Gilman		Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2003.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Prochaska et al in view of Yamamoto et al and Scott, Jr et al .

With regard to claims 1-5, 14-16, Prochaska et al (US 4,427,785) disclose translucent ceramic body and a method of its manufacturing, the method comprising:

densifying a ceramic body to form substantially translucent ceramic body which includes aluminum, the densifying process including heating the ceramic body under isostatic pressure up to 2100 kg/sq.sm (col. 7, lines 10-14) at temperature 1600-1700 degrees C.(col. 7, lines 23-25).

Prochaska et al do not disclose

the ceramic body includes about 99.9% aluminum;

contacting of the substantially translucent ceramic body with a molten inorganic flux, which includes an alkali metal borate capable of dissolving the ceramics.

Yamamoto et al (US 6,417,127) teaches using isostatic pressure using starting material containing 99.9% aluminum.

Scott, Jr et al (US 4,033,743) disclose contacting of the substantially translucent ceramic body with a molten inorganic flux (col. 3, lines 31-39) which includes an alkali metal borate (col. 4, lines 30-34) capable of dissolving the ceramics.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use starting material containing 99.9% aluminum in the Prochaska densifying process and

Art Unit: 2833

polish the Prochaska et al translucent ceramic body with a molten inorganic flux, as taught by Scott, Jr et al, to further increase its optical transmission.

With regard to claims 6-13, 19, Prochaska et al when modified by Yamamoto et al and Scott, Jr et al disclose (Scott et al):

a molten flux bath with temperature less than 1000 degrees and oxidizing atmosphere (col. 4, lines 34-39) (claims 6-8);

coating the ceramic body and heating the ceramic body (col. 4, lines 11-19) (claim 9);

removing flux residue with an acid solution (col. 4, lines 24-26) (claim 10);

the alkali metal borate presented by $(\text{Na}_2\text{O})_n(\text{B}_2\text{O}_3)_m$ (col. 4 lines 38-48) (claims 11 and 12);

the ceramic body is an arc tube (Abstract, lines 4-10) (claims 13 and 19).

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prochaska et al in view of Yamamoto et al and Scott, Jr et al as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Rhodes et al and Curtis Scott et al.

Prochaska et al when modified by Scott, Jr et al (US 6,294,871) disclose all of the limitations except for the alumina containing 0.5 weight percent of magnesia, said magnesia at a concentration at 400-1500 ppm.

Rhodes (US 4,174,973) discloses aluminum containing 0.5 weight percent of magnesia (col. 2, lines 57-59), Curtis Scott (US 6,294,871) disclose magnesia at a concentration at 400-1500 ppm (col. 4, lines 6-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Prochaska - Yamamoto et al -Scott, Jr et al aluminum with magnesia, as taught by respectively by Rhodes and Curtis Scott et al, to aid in process of sintering.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott, Jr et al (US 4,690,727) in view of Prochaska et al and Yamamoto et al.

Scott, Jr et al (US 4,033,743) disclose (Fig. 1) a discharge vessel (2) which defines a chamber

Art Unit: 2833

and polished by immersing in a molten inorganic flux (col. 3, lines 31-38; col. 4, lines 10-14) ;
electrodes sealed (11, 22) into the ends of the chamber, and
a fill (inherently) sealed within the chamber.

Scott, Jr et al do not disclose the starting material consists of 99.9% aluminum and process of densifying aluminum by applying sufficient pressure and temperature.

Prochaska et al disclose densifying aluminum by applying sufficient pressure and temperature as applied to claim 1 above.

Yamamoto et al disclose the starting material consists of 99.9% aluminum

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture Scott, Jr et vessel using the technology of Prochaska and the starting material consisting 99.9% aluminum as taught by Yamamoto et al, as an appropriate sintering technology for further polishing of the vessel.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, technology of sintering using high isostatic pressure as disclosed in Prochaska et al, one of basic technologies for manufacturing light emitting tubes, including the tubes which are subsequently polished. Using small amounts of magnesia in process of sintering the light emitting tubes, as taught by respectively by Rhodes and Curtis Scott et al, are well known in the art as an aid substance in process of sintering of the starting aluminum material.

Art Unit: 2833

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Gilman whose telephone number is (703) 305-0847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

Alexander Gilman



April 3, 2003

Application/Control Number: 09/812,432

Art Unit: 2833

Page 6